



# ADMINISTRATIVE NOTES

Newsletter of the Federal Depository Library Program

Vol. 12, no. 12

GP 3.16/3-2:12/12

May 31, 1991

## **Wayne P. Kelley, Jr. Becomes U.S. Superintendent of Documents**

*[The following news release was issued on April 15, 1991.]*

Wayne P. Kelley, Jr., has been named the Superintendent of Documents of the Government Printing Office (GPO), Public Printer of the United States Robert W. Houk announced today. Kelley is the former publisher of Congressional Quarterly and a journalist with more than 30 years of newspaper editing and reporting experience.

Kelley will become the Nation's 18th Superintendent of Documents, a post created by Congress in 1895.

Kelley will be in charge of an operation that distributes millions of Federal publications to the Nation's more than 1,390 depository libraries, supplies documents through the International Exchange Program of the Library of Congress, and oversees 23 bookstores nationwide and a publications mail order program that processes over 5,500 orders daily.

In making the announcement, Houk said Kelley "is the best possible choice for an office that is critical to the mission of disseminating Government information to the American people."

As publisher and executive vice president of Congressional Quarterly, Inc., from 1980 to 1990, Kelley directed all operations of the company that produces publications and newsletters covering Congress, politics, and national issues. He also held positions as executive editor, managing editor, and associate editor during his more than 20 years with the Washington-based publishing firm that is owned by The St. Petersburg (Florida) Times.


During his tenure with Congressional Quarterly Kelley revitalized two reference periodicals, boosting revenues 230 percent in 10 years. He conceived and developed online database service, acquired a daily newsletter, improved editorial quality of publications, and organized a seminar series explaining how Congress works that annually draws more than 2,000 attendees. He also conceived and supervised production of two reference books, Politics in America and Washington Information Directory.

Prior to entering the publishing field, Kelley had been a reporter serving as Washington correspondent for the Atlanta Journal from 1965 to 1969, and as city editor

for the Augusta Chronicle from 1960 to 1965.

A graduate of Vanderbilt University, Kelley was a Nieman Fellow in Journalism at Harvard from 1963 to 1964. He earned several Associated Press and Sigma Delta Chi awards while in Georgia.

---



## **Comments to Robert W. Houk, U.S. Public Printer**

### **From the Depository Library Council**

### **Spring 1991 (18 April 1991)**

#### **Section I. Introduction**

The Depository Library Council is confident that the Spring 1991 meeting marks the onset of a revitalization and enhancement of its advisory role to the Public Printer.

The Depository Library Council supports the Public Printer's plans to redirect the efforts of the Council to maximize its advisory capacity. Furthermore, Council looks forward to improved communication among GPO, library organizations, and government information providers and users.

To achieve this objective, the Council strongly urges that the annual Depository Library Conference not be restricted to the Washington, D.C. area. The current meeting structure provides an opportunity for the depository community as a whole to convene for discussion of matters of common concern. One way in which Council meetings have provided an opportunity for wider input has been through the location of its meetings in different places throughout the country. Council is concerned that if all the meetings are in the Washington, D.C. area, the opportunity for wider many to participate will be lost. Accordingly, Council believes that the annual Depository Library Conference should be held in other parts of the country at least every other year.

Additionally, Council will assist in the development of appropriate mechanisms to ensure communications between the depository library community and the Public Printer.

We welcome this opportunity to be more involved in the development of the policy decision-making process as it relates to the dissemination of, and access to, federal government information.

#### **Section II. DLC Role and Responsibilities**

A. In accepting the new directions set forth by the Public Printer, Council believes that addressing policy issues which reflect the diversity of the users of the Federal Depository Library Program is its major challenge.

To this end, Council's advisory role should be:

- 1) to assist the Public Printer in defining and focusing on policy issues faced by the Depository Library Program;
- 2) to critique policy options as they are developed, and,
- 3) to review and evaluate implementation of those options.

B. In addition, Council recognizes its responsibility to consult with the depository library community and the Government Printing Office to address operational concerns and problems.

C. The Depository Library Council also recognizes its role in assisting GPO in setting the agendas for future Annual Depository Library Conferences and Advisory Council meetings.

D. These and other tasks will be accomplished with the assistance of Council Coordinating Committees such as:

- 1) Policy
- 2) Operations
- 3) Program.

E. To foster communications among the GPO, Depository Library Council and the depository library community, Council suggests the formation of a new Administrative Notes column for the Operations Committee.

### **Section III. Issues for Continuing Consultation between the Public Printer and the Depository Library Council**

The following are policy issues critical to the depository library community. These are offered as potential agenda items for future Council meetings.


- 1) The strategic plan for the Government Printing Office.
- 2) Legislative proposals for the modernization of the Government Printing Office.
- 3) Online information for the Depository Library Program and attendant policy issues, including but not limited to, databases to be directly available from GPO, agency databases available via a GPO gateway, and cost sharing.
- 4) Relationship of GPO and depository libraries to the National Research and Education Network (NREN).
- 5) Fugitive information, including "no cost to the government" contracts that



result in publications not distributed to depository libraries.

- 6) Restrictions on the use of government information, including licensing, user fees, and other restrictions.
- 7) Formats in which Federal government information is distributed through the Depository Library Program.
- 8) Restructuring of the Depository Program.
- 9) Preservation issues -- e.g. retention of masters for CD's and microforms.
- 10) Programs for public awareness of the Depository Library Program (marketing).

---




## **Monthly Catalog Cumulative Index 1990, Volume 1 Will Be Distributed to Depositories Shortly**

Many depository librarians have informed LPS that Volume 1 of the Cumulative Index of the Monthly Catalog for 1990 was not received in their libraries.

The problem has been identified, and Volume 1 is now in the process of being reprinted. It will be distributed to depository libraries in the near future.

---



## **Congressional Record Pilot Project Update**

Data collection activities continue for the 1985 Congressional Record CD-ROM pilot project. The two-disk set, one of the five electronic dissemination projects, was shipped to all depository libraries on December 6, 1990. As of the end of April, fewer than 55% of the depositories receiving the materials had reported their library experience with the CD-ROMS to the General Accounting Office. In early May, another attempt was made to gather data, and more than 600 libraries were mailed a letter requesting a response. Questions about this pilot project or the other pilot projects should be addressed to: Jane Bartlett, Manager, Information Technology Program, U.S. Government Printing Office, Library Programs Service (SL), Washington DC 20401. Phone: (202) 275-1003.

## Automation Status of LPS in 1991

*[Address by Gil Baldwin, Chief of the Library Division, before the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, April 18, 1991, in Boston, Mass.]*

The Council Chair originally asked me to update you on the development of the ACSIS system, but I asked David if I could expand the topic to the state of automation in the Library Programs Service, since there are so many more things going on. Before I get rolling here, let me state one caveat - I'm not a techie. To me the computer is a tool, and I'm mainly interested in what it can do to improve the operation of the Depository Library Program, and only marginally interested in how it does it. Please remember this and take it easy when you ask questions.

### Background

First, let me take a minute to set the scene. There are six basic functions which LPS must accomplish to administer the Federal Depository Library Program and the Cataloging and Indexing Program. Briefly, these include the basic technical processing functions, which are the acquisition, classification, format conversion, distribution, and cataloging of publications. The sixth functional area, if you are counting, is the whole area of program administration, consisting of library inspections, designation and occasionally termination of depositories, and continuing education. This functional sketch is terribly abbreviated and simplified, as shown by the detailed update information provided by my colleagues, but the point is that LPS is engaged in an interrelated set of activities, each of which shares information and data with the other areas, as well as having its own distinctive data processing requirements.

This update, of course, is at best a snapshot, as LPS is a dynamic organization; in the midst of a data processing evolution with no end in sight. Change is not only ongoing and ever accelerating, but just as many of you have experienced in your own libraries, change is not always a clean and linear process. Nor does it progress evenly across all fronts. Even with the most careful planning and execution there can be setbacks, directional shifts, and new management initiatives. The same day I complain that some development takes too long I can also find myself reeling from the sheer pace and complexity of the information technology environment. Some of the same environmental issues that have affected libraries, industry, and academic settings have been felt in GPO. These movements include the decentralization of computer power from the mainframes out to users' desktops, and the whole trend of computer linkage and networking.

Let's step back five years into LPS history. It's 1986 again, and LPS has been back in the GPO main building just one year. Most of our day-to-day activities are manual processes, and our few automated applications are mostly mainframe-based and operated for us by what was then called GPO's Data Systems Service. LPS has three big systems, including the Depository Distribution Information System (DDIS) which essentially keeps track of item numbers, class stems, library address data, and library selections. We also have the Lighted Bin System running on a minicomputer, just one year old. This system



indicates which libraries' boxes are to receive which publications, and eliminates the drudgery of packing your shipments while carrying and trying to read from enormous printouts. The Cataloging Branch uses OCLC on a regular basis, and manages the mainframe-based Monthly Catalog production system. Beyond these three systems, we have exactly zero personal computers and zero LPS personnel with real computer skills or background.

### **Present Day**

Now, let's all fast forward to 1991. Today, LPS has about 50 personal computers; a rather mixed bag of IBM PC-XT's and AT's, some compatibles, and a number of IBM PS-2's. In fact, LPS had the first IBM PS-2 in all of GPO. Of course, slightly over half of all of these PC's are in the Cataloging area, and used to enter data into OCLC. The remainder are spread around LPS, in stand-alone configurations, running a variety of administrative tasks, home-grown production applications, and accessing data from the GPO mainframe. Even better, we have personnel who have a variety of computer skills, from the day-to-day operational, through analytical, on into programming. For a year now, we have had on the Library Division staff a full-time, dedicated Office Automation Specialist, whose job is primarily the care and feeding of LPS' microcomputers. The Cataloging Branch has just established a new position for a systems librarian, thankfully here just in time to manage the transition to the new OCLC system and software. And beyond LPS, GPO has a variety of training courses available for popular software packages, and we can call in assistance from the Office of Information Resources Management - OIRM - and a variety of other offices and areas when we encounter problems. All said we are in much better shape than in the Spring of 1987, when at the Council meeting in San Diego, when questioned about how many PC's LPS had, the answer was "Not one!"

In 1991, we still have the same three major systems we had in 1986, each of which is showing distinct signs of aging. All three systems are currently in various stages of the enhancement process. We also have developed a fairly complicated set of requirements for managing information about publications throughout their LPS processing life cycle. In brief, these requirements focus on the need for various units within LPS and GPO to share information about the publications as they pass through the system, and to reduce duplication of effort, particularly in terms of capturing the same data elements multiple times for different applications. In a nutshell, these are the functions that were to be addressed by the Acquisitions, Classification, and Shipment Information System, better known as ACSIS.

### **ACSYS Status**

ACSYS development has been underway since way back in 1983, when discussions were initiated under the conceptual framework of the Federal Documents Data Base (FDDDB). These discussions coalesced into the requirements for the ACSIS system, and were eventually formalized in a Detailed Functional Systems Requirements (DFSR) document. The completed DFSR was turned over to the OIRM staff in 1988 for development of the system. Throughout the life cycle of ACSIS there has been continual slippage in meeting established development milestones. These problems were generally resource-driven, meaning that the staff assigned to ACSIS development were often pulled off or redirected by higher priority activities. LPS' own commitment to the project has

had a spotty history, too, as the many shifts in LPS' management team over the years has taken its toll in terms of continuity. In 1990, the development process was returned to a phased approach, and milestones were established for the completion of Phase 1 by May 1991. Phase 1 consists essentially of the acquisitions and classification subsystems, generation of the shipping lists for hard copy distribution, and retrieval and download of data from some of GPO's mainframe applications. By January 1991, it was apparent to the system managers at LPS that the Phase 1 milestones were not going to be met, and we began a series of meetings intended to kick-start the project back into life.

Recently OIRM presented LPS with a revised plan to complete the development of Phase 1 of ACSIS by late 1991. The keystone of this revised plan, which is based on the System Development Life Cycle (SDLC) approach, is the establishment of a dedicated ACSIS project team. This team will consist of five OIRM staff, all working full time on ACSIS, and three Documents staff people. OIRM has also moved the responsibility for project management up the ladder, and the ACSIS development is being personally managed by the Deputy Director of OIRM. From the Documents side, LPS' interests are being represented by Sheila McGarr and myself, with the assistance of a program analyst from the Documents Technical Support Group. LPS believes that this commitment represents a fundamental change in how the ACSIS project is managed within OIRM, one that should result in meeting the functional system requirements.

Now all this sounds pretty good, but you may be asking, "What is ACSIS going to do for my library?" We see several answers to that. Improving the classification process will be a key benefit. By replacing our current manual card-file shelf list with an automated file, ACSIS should simplify duplicate identification. This will help solve the perennial problem of assigning two classes to the same publication, or using the same class for two different titles. Automating the shelf list should also help in the "fugitive documents" area, as it will make it easier for us to proactively identify missed issues of serials. Overall, we hope to improve the quality of our services and speed up document throughput, thus reducing the ever-present backlogs.

### **Lighted Bin System Enhancements**

As most of you no doubt know - in fact you usually know before we do - there were some fairly serious problems in the operation of the Lighted Bin System in 1990 and once again this year. These problems result in a jump in claims from depositories because the publications are being sent to the wrong recipients. LPS went through trouble-shooting perdition back in 1990 to get to the root of the problem, and it was eventually determined to have been caused by scrambled wiring connections to the lights that tell which bin gets the publication being thrown. Sadly, the way the system was originally designed there is no way for LPS to test for this kind of situation. When cross-wiring occurs in the course of system maintenance, the first that LPS knows about it is when claims start pouring out of the fax. In order to correct this system deficiency, the Depository Distribution Division has been working to establish requirements for an enhancement. Recently, LPS received a proposal from a vendor to furnish a software enhancement, which would provide each zone operator with the capability to compare the lighted bins with the library numbers during the distribution process. Using the proposed new feature, the operator would enter a valid item number, and the corresponding bin lights will come on. Then the lights could be compared to a screen



display listing the libraries which selected the item. If the lights and listing match, everything is in good shape. Because of the magnitude of the expense associated with this enhancement, it will probably actually take place in fiscal year 1992.

## **Other Mainframe Enhancements:**

### **DDIS**

The Depository Administration Branch, Sheila McGarr's area, has been working on an enhancement to one of the DDIS outputs. By popular request, LPS has modified the annual item selection printout for easier readability and use. The item numbers which you select will be followed by a "Y" - the ones you don't select will be followed by a blank. We hope this will make the report much quicker and less painful to scan through.

### **Monthly Catalog System/GPO Cataloging Tapes**

Over the course of the last year we have been working with OIRM to enhance the Monthly Catalog Production System to produce the revised GPO Cataloging Tapes. These tapes go a long way toward alleviating the problems with old Monthly Catalog tapes sold by the Library of Congress. The major benefits are the elimination of the dreaded item-specific availability records, the addition of correction records when GPO updates its cataloging, and the inclusion of the collective records for serials and multipart monographs. The new tapes enhancement is still ongoing, and LPS is cooperating with the LC, interested aftermarket vendors of the data, and OCLC to completely debug the process.

## **Microcomputer Applications**

In LPS we now use a large number of microcomputer applications in our day-to-day work. Many of the applications are customized programs developed specially for, and in most cases, by LPS staff. I don't want to go into great detail about these; I think you have heard about most of them before. Some of the examples include the generation of the Paper Shipping lists, the Monthly Catalog List of Special Materials cataloging, the MoCat Corrections file, a claims processing data base, Depository Services PAMALA system, and so on. Originally, these applications were often started by program managers in their quote "spare time," but now the program writing falls primarily to our Office Automation Specialist, John Walters.

## **Distribution of ASCII Files**

These days most of our administrative and operational data is available to us internally in machine-readable form, and we have been considering the desirability of distributing some of these files to you on diskettes, perhaps as generic ASCII text files, or maybe as dBase files. The big question in this discussion is, of course, "Are the depositories ready, willing, and able to use the disks?" The jury is still out on this question, but in our occasional role as a Federal publisher, it is a topic of great concern. LPS doesn't want to send out information in a format which is not useful, but we are not really in a position to give much support to these disks once they are out there. So far the response to our experiment of distributing the ASCII format version of the Administrative Notes index has been underwhelming, but some of the feedback which we have gotten suggests that some depositories are unsure how to use even this rather basic technique.



## **LPS Standards Development**

Now, as I mentioned before, LPS has about 50 PC's on board. Even though these machines are all IBM or 100% compatibles, there is a remarkable variety of configurations and capabilities. One of the things I wanted to do as soon as possible was to conduct a detailed inventory of our hardware and software assets, with the intention of establishing LPS policy in the area of microcomputer (PC) hardware and software. You wouldn't believe the problems we have with our NikeNet, running around trying to figure who can take what kind of diskette. There are actually only two PC's in LPS that are capable of reading all four of the popular combinations of diskette size and density. In the interest of standardizing the PC hardware and software environment in LPS, lists of recommended software packages and a basic PC platform have been developed. Future purchases in LPS are to be consistent with these standards. Individual areas may purchase non-standard packages, but such decisions should be based on specific requirements, and made with the understanding that support and maintenance may be adversely effected.

The "minimum" hardware platform standardized within LPS is very similar to the standard workstation described in the "Minimum Technical Guidelines for Federal Depository Libraries," which will be published in Administrative Notes once it has been approved by Council. We also came up with LPS standards for software, a listing which, of course, is not intended to be comprehensive, and naturally, may be modified from time to time. Operational requirements must be used to justify purchases of other software packages.

## **LPS LAN Planning**

OK, so now we have all of these PC's, all running by themselves and doing a variety of things, but none of them are linked. What next? Enter the LPS Local Area Network, our LAN to be. I mentioned in the context of ACSIS that we have a crying need to share information, not only within LPS, but in a much broader context. LPS is developing a plan and a budget for a LAN, which assuming approval, should result in the LPS LAN coming up in 1993. Why so long? Simply, because a system of this complexity and expense requires long-range operational and budget planning to make it happen. In general, we must plan for a LAN with about 70 users, running a wide variety of applications and software, and linking not only the mixed bag of hardware that we already have, but adding about 20 more PC's over the next 18 months.

I'm working with some people in GPO's Office Automation Group to develop a set of requirements for the LPS LAN, and its a very challenging process. Some of our requirements are complex, particularly in the area of external connections. We want to plan in the ability to link the LAN with the GPO mainframe, the LPS Bulletin Board, Internet or other developing national networks, other GPO LAN's, OCLC, and to provide for remote dial-up access.

We are also running a variety of applications and software, much of it in the area of administrative automation, such as word processing, document generation, etc. This is pretty straightforward. Where it gets more interesting is in some of the critical operational applications, such as the generation of the shipping list. These involve very large data base files, requiring multi-user access, and have very rigorous demands on

back-up, security, and system availability. I don't have a great deal of detail to share with you at this point, but in general, my approach is to design, cost out, and justify a system that will meet our requirements through the 1990's and try to avoid any technological dead ends.

### **Project Hermes/LPS Bulletin Board**

During the Spring of 1990 the decision was made for the Government Printing Office (GPO) to participate in the emerging Supreme Court Opinion Network (SCON), which was being established to provide instant electronic dissemination of Supreme Court opinions, slip opinions, etc. GPO applied for one of the 16 ports into the system based primarily on the idea of providing this information to the public via the Federal Depository Library Program. This led to the establishment of what you know as the Project Hermes Bulletin Board (PHBB). However, it is more correct to say that Project Hermes is actually the first special interest group (SIG) on the Federal Depository Library Program Bulletin Board System (FDLP/BBS).

*We are now taking action to significantly enhance communications between LPS and the depository libraries. This new channel is the electronic bulletin board.*

I recently had occasion to respond to a letter concerning the rationale for selecting a dial-up dissemination strategy for Project Hermes. The decision to proceed with an electronic bulletin board operating in a dial-up mode was based on two fundamental considerations: a

mechanism for a timely initiation of the project, and a desire to assess the depositories' demand for this information across the depository system. Concerning the first point, the opportunity for GPO to participate in SCON required a rapid decision and quick action, which meant that GPO selected a means of dissemination that could be initiated without significant inroads into the existing FDLP program budget. Furthermore, the Library Programs Service (LPS) selected the dial-up access because it allowed the fullest range of participation in the depository community. Access to networks is by no means universal among the depositories, but any library having a microcomputer, a modem, and a telephone could participate in Project Hermes.

### **Bulletin Board Developments**

We are now taking action to significantly enhance communications between LPS and the depository libraries. This new channel is the electronic bulletin board, the FDLP/BBS, for want of a less intimidating name. Maybe one of our near-term goals should be to come up one of those warm and fuzzy names for the system. I'm open to suggestions. LPS has obtained a commitment from GPO's Office of Information Resources Management to provide a very knowledgeable person to assist us in expanding the scope of the bulletin board. This person will function as the system operator, or sysop, until LPS is able to develop and staff a position on a permanent basis. He will also work with existing LPS staff in the Library Division to enhance our skills in operating the FDLP/BBS and responding to user inquiries.

The bulletin board is being initiated on a "pilot," or test mode, basis. The three phases of the development are consistent with those described in our bulletin board



study, completed last year. A few weeks ago, I was attending an information policy forum on the NREN, and one the speakers described the three phases of NREN's development: Today, Tomorrow, and Eventually. Well, as attractive as that sounds, it's actually pretty close to the three development phases that we are following. Phase 1, which is available today, consists of new special interest groups, or SIG's, being added to the bulletin board, and will provide program administrative information files for reading or downloading. These files will take the form of messages, describing briefly the content and format of the information, with an attached file. For example you might see a message describing articles from an issue of Administrative Notes, with article titles, in ASCII text file format. Other files and formats we will be experimenting with include corrections to Monthly Catalogs in dBase format, probably some of our instructions and guidelines, in WordPerfect format, and so on. Phase 2, which will probably be somewhat later than a literal tomorrow, will test an interactive, electronic mail situation, limited to the regional depositories. Phase 3, the eventually phase, will expand the interactive capability to all depositories. Additional participants in any phase may be authorized by LPS. It is recognized that the hardware, software, or telecommunications configuration of the test period will probably not be the ultimate, long-term system configuration. The LPS electronic bulletin board is using the Project Hermes platform and telecommunications system as its starting point.

I realize that dial-up access may not be the most desirable means of access for many libraries, and it will probably not be the long-term method which is selected for disseminating FDLDP program information. LPS has chosen this initial approach to the bulletin board for two reasons. First, use of the existing Project Hermes Bulletin Board assets allows LPS to initiate a bulletin board within our existing budget and to gain practical experience with this avenue of dissemination, while we examine options for the ultimate direction of the bulletin board. Second, continuation of the dial-up access allows the broadest spectrum of participation among the depositories.

LPS staff have met with the GPO Production Department people who have been running Project Hermes to discuss a division of responsibility to expand the bulletin board while maintaining the Project Hermes activity. The following approach has been agreed upon: the Production Department will continue to receive the data from the Supreme Court and convert the file for loading for Project Hermes. The physical assets of the bulletin board will migrate to LPS over the next few months, meaning that we will be moving the 386-based system PC, the incoming phones lines, the multiplexer, etc.

LPS will take over the user support telephone line function in the near future, but until that occurs, Production personnel will continue to provide telephone user support. One of our cataloging staff, Tony Ford, will be learning the bulletin board operation, and will probably be the voice of LPS on the user support line in the future. Like the rest of us at LPS, Tony is a bulletin board novice, and he will be learning through the time-honored tradition of on-the-job-training. I'd like to make one comment concerning the user support issue. We recognize that the board has not been the most user friendly so far, and has left some users wondering what to do next, especially when attempting to download files. However, a significant portion of the user inquiries to date reflect incomplete knowledge of the users' own telecommunications software. We have obtained a software upgrade, and we will attempt to enhance the messages on the board to

prompt the users to perform the necessary actions on their end. However, it's really incumbent upon the board's users to be totally comfortable with the operation of the software at their end. LPS is just not going to be able to offer extensive assistance to users whose own software is the root of the problem.

Most of us in LPS are probably more in the dark about operating a bulletin board than any of you who dial in, so we ask you to be patient with us. We are on the learning curve, too. I would welcome your input about how the FDLP/BBS might be improved or what you like about it.

### **Conclusion**

So, as you can see, LPS automation is alive and well. Everything isn't perfect, but after all, we have to live in the real world; a world is subject to many constraints. LPS is making a lot of progress, much of which may not have been readily apparent to you in the field. Automation has allowed us to do more with less, so even as our staffing has declined and the operating environment has become more complicated, due in no small part to the advent of electronic media in the program, we have been able to manage. The people at LPS are very much aware of areas in the operation where we would really benefit from increased automation, and we are making focused efforts in those areas. In fact, I have in my files a list of over 14 major and minor PC applications to enhance our operations. I hope that five years from now LPS will be able to report developments which are just as exciting and significant as those of the last five years.

---

## **What Has the Depository Services Staff Been Doing For You Lately?**

*[Address by Joe McClane, Chief, Depository Services Staff, before the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, April 17, 1991, in Boston, Mass.]*

On page three of the Council issue of Administrative Notes [v. 12, #9], you will find an update on the recent activities of the Depository Services Staff. As you know, we are less than one month away from the deadline for the return of the 1991 Biennial Survey. So far, about 40 percent of the survey answer sheets have been returned, and we have not been experiencing any major problems with the survey.

But we have been experiencing problems with what we term "survey fatigue." Libraries are being asked to complete a number of depository related surveys, and the response rate is declining. An example of survey fatigue is the response we got from the Administrative Notes index on floppy survey. We received approximately four responses, all in favor of retaining the index in paper. I say "approximately" because one woman telephoned and merely said: "I'm for paper!" and then she hung-up. Come to think of it, that woman could have been responding to any one of our surveys. What troubles us is that these four individuals might not speak for all depositories. This is an article on the subject in the March 30 issue of Administrative Notes, and I highly recommend it, as



I wrote it.

Today, I'm going to talk about the "Program Support" initiatives we are taking at LPS. First a brief word of explanation. New publishing technologies, etc. coupled with fiscal and technological challenges and increasing fiscal constraints on many depositories have created new challenges for the Federal Depository Library Program. As librarians, we have focused much of our attention on the publications themselves: their format, their acquisition, their handling, etc. But the increasing independence among depositories and between libraries and GPO demands that we focus more of our time, attention and resources on the Federal Depository Library Program itself. This aspect of user support is referred to as "program support", as opposed to the "product support" which agency publishers offer in support of their particular products.

At GPO "program support" can be divided into three related, and some what overlapping functions: Inspections, Communications and Education. The legally required depository inspection program ensures that libraries are meeting their custodian, public service and public access requirements. The Government's holdings in depository libraries are now worth many 100 millions of dollars. So the Government has a considerable proprietary interest in ensuring that these materials are properly maintained. Inspections also help to ensure that free access to depository resources is provided. The inspection program has been recently strengthened by providing libraries with information needed to do a self study before the inspector arrives. Also, Depository Services, using information from the PAMALA database, can better spot anomalies and therefore target potential problem libraries.

Increasing interdependence demands better communication. This year we initiated a program that permitted Regional Depositories to fax claims. This was later expanded to the selective libraries, and then depository inquiry forms were also allowed to be faxed, all of which have expedited the handling of claims and inquiry forms.

The production time of Administrative Notes was reduced from one month, to one week, making that publication much more timely. The contents of Administrative Notes has also been improved. More emphasis is given to improving communications between GPO and depositories providing contact persons, status reports and other useful information, as this latest issue clearly represents. DSS is also investigating alternative user friendly formats for the Instructions, Superseded List, etc. I won't get into the LPS BB as Gil Baldwin will cover that topic tomorrow. But the bulletin board is also part of this effort.

Finally, there is the education function of "Program Support". As you know, DSS already conducts the week long Interagency Depository Seminar (which will be held next month). The demand for the seminar is so great that we must constantly turn people away. And although DSS does conduct some regional workshops, most requests for workshops must be declined for lack of resources. As you can see there is a great demand for continuing education, and that is why the proposed Depository Library Conference is so exciting. The Conference will provide additional avenue to increase the continuing education of the depository community. GPO is also committed to increasing our visibility at depository related conferences and seminars. So those libraries that most

want continuing education, smaller libraries with restricted travel funds, will have an opportunity to take advantage of these efforts.

By taking all of these needed steps to strengthen the FDLP, we will help to ensure that the FDLP is able to more effectively meet the challenges brought about by our rapidly changing world.



## Information Technology Program Update

*[Address by Jane Bartlett, Manager of the Information Technology Program, Library Programs Service, before the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, April 17, 1991, in Boston, Mass.]*

When the agenda for this spring Depository Library Council meeting was published, several colleagues pointed out to me that the Information Technology Program Update was slated for 45 minutes of time on the first morning of this 2 1/2 day meeting. 45 Minutes! What could be the reason for that much time?

The reason **has** to be the Information Technology Program...and maybe not the Program itself so much as what the Program has come to represent to many depository librarians. It must be because Council felt that the ITP... this "matrix position" as Bonnie Trivizas, Director of Library Programs Service, describes it... is concerned with matters of current interest to depository libraries - matters such as information technologies and electronic formats and federal information dissemination - and, because of this, sufficient time needed to be allocated to touch on the myriad aspects of it. If that is the case, then maybe 45 minutes is not enough.

Never fear. I will not try to present an update of the state of the information technology universe. What I will try to do is limit the focus this morning to areas in which I have been direct operational involvement during the past six months and leave the other policy and implementation issues to appropriate others.

Before I start, though, I beg the indulgence of Council for a moment while I provide some background for newcomers who are attending this meeting. For those, I'd like to briefly describe the Information Technology Program and put it in perspective.

The ITP was established in late 1987 by the then-Public Printer of the United States, Ralph Kennickell, in response to a request from the Joint Committee on Printing (JCP) to have the Government Printing Office (GPO) develop a plan and then manage some yet-to-be-selected electronic dissemination pilot projects for depository libraries.

Even though the original intent of the Program was narrow, from its inception in 1987 until the present, the ITP has come to represent many things to many people.



For some, the ITP is responsible for all matters electronic both within Library Programs Service (LPS) and within the Federal Depository Library Program. These expectations include ITP responsibility for acquiring federal sector and even private sector offline and online government information resources for depositories, for managing telecommunications activities such as bulletin boards, for establishing minimum standards and for developing training programs for depository librarians, for assisting with LPS' office automation activities, as well as implementing, managing, and evaluating the electronic pilot projects.

Some others assume that the ITP is the focal point for GPO's participation in the resolution of federal electronic information dissemination issues, such as the proposing of legislation and involvement in the setting of industry or government standards.

All of these activities are important and worthwhile and all are of interest to the ITP. However, the ITP, with its staff of one (me), is not, at the moment, actively involved in most of these arenas. GPO and Library Programs Services now have many others who are active participants in electronic dissemination of government information matters, both at the policy-making and operational level, and it is this distribution of responsibility that will, in the long run, prove to be far most beneficial to those interested in the viability of the Depository Library Program in the electronic age.

So, what is ITP? Although the focus could change six months from now, for the moment, the ITP could best be defined as the area within Library Programs Service that is primarily involved with completing and evaluating the pilot projects, involved with assisting LPS to develop a framework and strategies for incorporating the challenges of electronic information products into existing routines, and involved with serving as a contact point for depository librarians with their management and service questions surrounding federal electronic information dissemination through the Depository Library Program.

Now that we have defined the current operating umbrella of the ITP, let's get on to the ITP Update.

There are three areas of ITP involvement that I'd like to talk to you about today: the pilot projects, the "technology tea" survey, and activities and concerns about the acquisition of more electronic products in the Depository Library Program.

I'm going to make some assumptions: first, I'm going to assume that you have read (or will read when you have time) the ITP Update in the April 15th issue of **Administrative Notes**. I'll do my best not to repeat information that you could easily find in print. Secondly, I will assume that you have some basic understanding of the particulars of the pilot projects. These are also frequently discussed in **Administrative Notes** but, for a refresher, some of you may wish to go back to the full plan that was published in the LPS newsletter in July of 1988 [Administrative Notes, v.9, #13].

### **The Pilot Projects**

The JCP-approved and GPO-managed electronic dissemination demonstrations really didn't become well known until the previously-mentioned publication of the plan in June

of 1988. Since then, they have been known to one and all as "the pilot projects". I'm sure that there are other pilot projects out there, but, to those of us in LPS, these are the "high five".

To Depository Library Council, to the Public Printer, and to many librarians in the field, it may seem as though the pilot projects have been going on forever, but, in truth, it has been less than two years since the first of the pilots was actually implemented.

It wasn't until May 1989 that, amidst a lot of "hoopla", that the **first** project was initiated. That was when the Bureau of the Census' Test Disc #2 CD-ROM, the first of three CD-ROM projects, was distributed to depositories. And the **last** of the five projects, the second of the two online pilots, wasn't implemented until late January of this year. It was then that the representatives from the seventeen depository test sites for the Department of Energy Pilot Project met in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, for a training session.

At the end of July of this year, we will have completed all five electronic dissemination demonstrations and, if all scheduled deadlines are met and if the staffing resources for analysis and report-writing are there, we are planning to deliver the pilot project reports to the Public Printer no later than the beginning of the federal 1992 fiscal year.

At this point, let me give you the latest news on each pilot project. I'll start with the most recent one to begin and work backwards.

I mentioned the DOE pilot project a moment ago to emphasize a point. As you know, the first part of the DOE project involves providing test libraries online access to a previously unavailable DOE bibliographic database. The test period for this project began February 1, 1991, and will run until the end of July. Seventeen test site libraries are searching the database and, in some cases, using a gateway to DIALOG to integrate results from searches of DIALOG energy files with parallel searches on DOE's database. The libraries are also testing a COSATI to MARC-like conversion utility when they download bibliographic records against their library selection profile of DOE microfiche of contractor's reports and upload them into their online catalogs. The objective of this component of the project is not to test the gateway to DIALOG and test the conversion utility but, primarily, is to measure whether enhanced bibliographic access increases use of energy report literature.

A second aspect of the project will be a technology assessment to determine whether there is some technology that would be more acceptable and cost-effective than the currently-distributed microfiche. As you may know, a full selection of DOE Contractor's Reports can mean 18,000 titles on microfiche each year to a depository. That is a lot of microfiche to file and store, especially a chore if the material is not well used. Several hundred depositories, those currently receiving DOE microfiche as well as those not, are expected to be surveyed to collect information for this portion of the study.

As this is the only one of the five pilot studies that is being managed by the agency rather than GPO, the final report on this project will be prepared by the staff at DOE's Office of Scientific and Technical Information and is to be delivered to the Public Printer



no later than September 30 of this year.

I'd like to mention briefly one aspect of this pilot project that has raised an important question: was the telecommunications cost sharing requirement of this pilot project a sufficiently significant deterrent that it kept libraries from participation in the project?

When the pilot project was planned, it was expected that there would be a lot of competition for the 20 test site slots for the online access phase of the project. To the surprise of many involved with this pilot, fewer than 10% of the 255 libraries that were eligible to be test sites applied for the slots. As one requirement for participation was the library's willingness to pay a portion of the telecommunications costs, some have wondered if that requirement alone was responsible for keeping libraries from demonstrating an interest.

You may be interested to know that some very preliminary data, taken from survey returns of more than 150 libraries that chose not to participate in the project, indicates that, for 78% of these libraries, the responsibility for telecommunications costs was not the reason given for not wishing to be a test site.

Let us now move on to another project.

The last CD-ROM pilot project to be initiated was the distribution of the final edition of the 1985 **Congressional Record** in CD-ROM to all federal depositories. This 2-disc set was shipped in December of 1990, along with technical documentation and the data collection instructions and forms for the pilot project evaluation. Of the 1000 libraries that have returned a postcard that was included with the shipment, nearly 74% indicated that their libraries had CD-ROM equipment. This percentage is a substantial increase over the 40% that the General Accounting Office found in a 1988 survey.

265 of the 1000 returns claimed to have no CD-ROM equipment. Of those depositories, 35% were small or medium-sized academic libraries and 22% were public libraries of the same size.

What is the status of the evaluation of the **Congressional Record** pilot project? Well, on our list of "lessons learned" with these pilot projects, one lesson is becoming painfully clear. It is a lot easier to talk about doing pilot projects and to plan for them and even to implement them than it is to collect and evaluate the data. As I've come to appreciate and you experienced researchers already know, the latter two steps, the collection and evaluation are extremely time and labor intensive.

One problem encountered that was not originally factored into the overall pilot project plan was the difficulty we would face in getting libraries to participate in the pilot projects and, if willing to participate, to meet scheduled deadlines for evaluation returns. In the case of the **Congressional Record** pilot project, for example, although the deadline for the suggested test period was extended an additional month to allow for a late start due to the Christmas/New Year's holiday season, evaluation returns to the General Accounting Office (GAO), our technical advisors in these projects, are, to date, less than

half of what is needed to meet GAO standards for sufficient data. Unless we can encourage increased participation, our project data will not be generalizable across the depository community.

If I may, I'd like to pause for a moment and inject a personal note. We, in Library Programs Service, observe that some libraries are showing symptoms of an ailment we call "survey fatigue". This disease is marked by a reluctance to gather user data and a resistance to returning project surveys.

We are aware of the burdens that many libraries face, not the least is the struggle to adjust to the changing government information environment. One of the reasons for conducting the pilot projects is to weigh the cost to libraries (the burden, so to speak) as well as the benefits of access to electronic information.

*One of the reasons for conducting the pilot projects is to weigh the cost to libraries (the burden, so to speak) as well as the benefits of access to electronic information.*

This is a challenging time. The Joint Committee on Printing and GPO, in partnership with the GAO and the agencies, are taking a lead role in using these pilot projects to gather information about the costs and benefits of dissemination of government information in electronic form. It is important that we have data, and we are dependent upon library participation to gather that data. Please spread the word through your networks and your newsletters that, although we're nearing the end, we're not there yet. We ask libraries, please, to conduct the brief studies, to fill out the evaluations, and to submit the returns by the requested dates. Enough said.

Let's return to the pilot project countdown.

The data collection period for the Economic Bulletin Board (or EBB) online pilot project is over, and the period of analysis has begun.

As you may recall, all 1400 depositories were given an opportunity to be test sites for this project. Of the 361 applicants, 100 were selected to participate in a study that would assess the costs and usage for seven months worth of dial-up access to this bulletin board containing current economic statistics. A few of the original 100 dropped out along the way and were replaced by others matching the profile for selection. Interestingly enough, even within that test site group, there were some who never used the EBB.

We have also experienced some trouble getting returns from this group of 100. At last count, only 88 of the 100 libraries have reported the statistics that they were asked to maintain and returned their comments on their experience with the bulletin board.

Although there is much data still to examine, I'd like to share with you some of the very preliminary spreadsheet information that is automatically collected by the computer at the Department of Commerce as the libraries used the Economic Bulletin Board.

93 of the 100 test libraries actually dialed up the EBB at some time during the seven



month trial, and there were over 3200 recorded sessions by the depositories. Some used the EBB more than a hundred times during this period; others only once.

Average use provides some interesting comparisons.

The average number of sessions per test site library averaged around 5 overall the seven months.

As library payment of telecommunications costs was an issue with this project, and the bulletin board was on the East Coast, it was interesting to see that the highest overall average use per month of the EBB was by libraries in the Mountain Time Zone.

It will come as little surprise that, by size of test library, large libraries had a higher number of sessions per month, on average, than medium or small libraries. Average use by Regional as compared to Selective depositories was similar for the first two months, but the use by Selectives peaked in July, one month after the beginning of the study period and declined from that point forward. Regional use hit a new average high in September, declining slowly until December when use dropped precipitously.

One final, interesting figure: average use by public libraries was greater than that for academic libraries for all months except the last two: November and December.

So, what does that tell us? It's too early to tell, as that data has to be correlated and cross-tabulated with other figures, but I'm sure it will be interesting. So stay tuned!

The Environment Protection Agency (EPA)'s **Toxic Release Inventory** CD-ROM was distributed to 555 depositories in June of 1990. 275 of the libraries that received the disc last year were mailed the first packet of data collection materials last month. These libraries have been asked to conduct a one-month usage survey of the **TRI** CD-ROM and report the results of that usage after May 15. If a library received the March mailing, it will be sent a second packet in early May that will contain a library survey and a postpaid return envelope. The returns are due by May 24.

An aside here: sometimes a library is randomly selected as a site for collecting data, and that library either cannot find the publication in question, has never used it, doesn't have equipment, etc. That information is important for a pilot project report, too. We ask that, in such circumstances, libraries specify on the library survey data collection instrument the reasons why they did not or could not provide usage data and return the survey to GAO.

Last but not least, we are back to where we began the pilot projects...with the Bureau of the Census' **Test Disc #2**. As you may have observed, no official pilot project survey has even been done of depository library reaction to that disc. We're soon to remedy that. Since the advent of that CD-ROM, which, incidentally, was the first ever CD-ROM distributed through the Depository Library Program, at least eight other Census titles have been distributed to selecting libraries.

What we are planning to do now is to assess depository reaction to any and all of the

Census CD-ROMs. With assistance from GAO, a user survey and library survey are in the process of design. These surveys will, among other things, assess user satisfaction with the structure of the data on the disc, the public domain software that accompanied the discs, the documentation, as well as training and user support provided by Census. In May and June of this year, it is expected that a randomly-selected, representative group of all depository libraries will be asked to measure usage and reaction to the Census discs that are in their collections. This survey should be interesting, as there appears to be a fair amount of depository usage of the Census CD-ROMs.

In summary, what do we have? We have five pilot projects, in various stages of data collection and analysis. As depositories have a stake in the results of these pilots, libraries that are requested to participate in particular studies are asked to persist in their efforts through these next few final months. If we work at this together, I hope to be able to report to you in six months that the pilots projects are part of history.

*What is GPO or LPS or the ITP doing to acquire more electronic government information for the Depository Library Program?*

*[Material which was presented at this point on the "Technology Tea" survey results will be published in more detailed form in a later issue of Administrative Notes - Ed.]*

### **Acquisitions**

Now I'd like to move on to the final portion of my presentation: the part of the ITP update that I suspect you most wanted to hear. If I'm correct, a question foremost in your mind is "what is GPO or LPS or the ITP doing to acquire more electronic government information for the Depository Library Program?" Am I right?

And you also probably don't really care **who** is responsible for providing it, as long as you have the opportunity to acquire this information through the Depository Library Program free of charge for your library. Is that also correct?

How do I know that? Well, you may recall that I am a librarian by profession and have been a documents librarian to boot. I know that the "twin peaks" of depository librarianship are acquisitions and public service, and that documents librarians are devoted to the latter and aggressive with the former. I just finished reading 3000 blocks of impassioned text included in the "technology tea" surveys and found that sentiment imbedded in most statements.

The survey and frequent telephone contacts that I have with librarians in the field all seem to express a growing anxiety about the amount of federal government information in electronic format that is not being distributed through the Depository Library Program. There is a concern and a fear that LPS and GPO are "outside the loop" in the area of dissemination of government electronic information, and that GPO needs to **do something about it now**.

Well, there are some major challenges, but GPO is not just sitting idly by. The Public Printer and his staff, the Superintendent of Documents and his staff, the Director



of Library Programs Service and her staff have spent countless hours trying to come to grips with the matter.

Operationally, Sheila McGarr and I have set up "normalization" procedures. Rather than depend on just one or two individuals to acquire electronic publications, since February, we have been involved in developing procedures for LPS' acquisitions specialists to incorporate electronic acquisitions into their existing routines.

We also monitor federal government news publications such as **Government Publications News** or **Federal Computer Weekly** or **CD-ROM End-User** to identify who is doing what electronic project.

We have been a presence at Special Interest Group for CD-ROM Applications and Technology [SIGCAT] meetings to interface with agency representatives.

We have worked with GPO's Customer Service staff to ensure that they are including the advantages of the depository library dissemination mechanism in their "pitch" to agencies.

We have been using our personal contacts to encourage participation in the Program.

So, what is it getting us?

Well, if you go back and look at the "E" shipping lists, and we have sent out more than 25 of those since last October, you will see that we have sent out many electronic products. That is a significant increase over last year.

And we have some new things coming in to the Program; for example, DMA's "Digital Charting of the World", the USGS "Digital Data Series", and, probably, the Social Security Administration's "POMS" manual.

However, we are frustrated. We feel we are expending a lot of energy and not getting much in terms of results.

What is the problem?

Life was a lot simpler when we were just dealing with paper publications. With paper, there was at least a government-wide consensus that agencies were obligated to go through GPO for their printing needs or get a waiver to do otherwise. With this consensus, it was relatively easy to get the printing officers of agencies to agree that Title 44 required them to provide copies for the Depository Library Program. As librarians who monitor the fugitive document issue know, even with consensus, there was not full compliance.

The environment with electronic dissemination of information is entirely different. Even though GPO and JCP maintain that the intent of Title 44 applies to electronic government information, the consensus is not there. Production of, for example, off-line electronic products, such as CD-ROMs and floppy diskettes, is not centralized in one

agency, so the opportunities to "ride" agencies' productions are not available if the agency does not go through GPO's services.

Some government agencies, such as the Bureau of the Census, who have a commitment to the Depository Library Program, voluntarily use GPO's electronic services for many of their CD-ROMs. Our dissemination mechanism provided by the Depository Library Program is an incentive for them to go through GPO. When they do, GPO, with appropriated money, pays for the rider copies that go to depositories, as well as the distribution costs. Census is happy; GPO is happy; and libraries are happy.

Unfortunately, the Census model is not universal. Under existing legislation, there is no consensus that agencies must use the Depository Library Program to disseminate their product. And OMB, in its revision of A-130, is reportedly likely to strongly encourage this route but not make it a requirement.

Why don't agencies disseminate their electronic products to the general public through the Depository Library Program? Is it that they don't know about the Program or is it that they deliberately avoid it?

There is some evidence that agencies do not know about the Program and its advantages to them. A number of these CD-ROM projects, for example, do not go through the agency printing officer, the executive representative with whom GPO has traditionally maintained contact. It may be up to GPO to expand its outreach efforts to include program people in the agencies. We'll also have to do a better job of explaining the benefits that the GPO services can provide. Plans are being made now to use a variety of avenues to "increase the visibility" of GPO's services and the advantages of the Depository Library Program.

There is also mounting evidence that agencies are deliberately avoiding the Depository Library Program with their electronic products. For some, the Federal Depository Library Program is a disincentive.

Probably for most, the reason for not participating in the program is economic. As there is no consensus that they are **required** to go through GPO or provide depository copies, 500 or 800 or 1400 copies is an expense they can avoid.

And replication of discs is not the only cost. Per unit costs of a CD-ROM or floppy diskette are relatively low, but it is the user support costs that really make wide distribution undesirable to some. When the agency must provide customer service lines, training courses and documentation to a group that is not their primary patron group and who may not be familiar with the data and who need a lot of special training, you can well believe that they might see depository access a significant disincentive. And they may see no advantages to the Federal Depository Library Program.

What can we do? **You** know and **I** know and **GPO** knows that we have a serious challenge on our hands. The future viability of the Depository Library Program may depend on how we face this challenge and how we chose to overcome the existing obstacles.



Clarifying existing legislation would be a bonus, but I suspect that we're going to have to do without that easy road.

*Depository librarians could also do a better job of providing an incentive for agencies to voluntarily participate in the program.*

I propose that we look at what we can do with the lemons that we have. Let's examine those disincentives carefully. Rather than see them as excuses to complain, let's look at ways to turn them around. Let's work together to give our Depository Library Program some credibility, some compelling reason that an agency would ask to provide access to its information through our resources. Let's find a way to make the Depository Library Program an **incentive** for federal government electronic dissemination, rather than a disincentive.

One way may be to get our own houses in order. We at GPO will need to do a better job of selling the program to agency people. I believe that we can do that.

Sheila McGarr and I, in Library Programs Service, have been making personal efforts on behalf of the Program through our individual contacts, by telephone, and by reminder letters. We've been only marginally successful with this approach. Maybe what we need, instead, is a professional team, representing all of GPO, that goes out into the federal community and sells itself. I propose we market GPO and the Depository Library Program in a positive way, rather than treat agencies as miscreants with our nagging reminders of non-compliance.

Depository librarians could also do a better job of providing an incentive for agencies to voluntarily participate in the program. Shaking fingers and sending threatening or highly critical letters to federal publishers have been known to have a counterproductive effect on agencies. The attack has been known to repel and to drive some electronic products out of our grasp.

I suggest that depository librarians develop a new tone in their interaction with the agencies. That tone needs to include a large measure of old-fashioned good manners and salesmanship. After all, if there is no consensus about a requirement to distribute materials through the Depository Library Program, we cannot use clout. We need to persuade.

Librarians might think about how they approach federal publishers and whether that approach makes participation in the program an attractive option for the federal publishers. As researchers and information scientists, you may be able to use those skills to provide compelling evidence from your depository library that clearly demonstrates to the agency the advantages of voluntary depository distribution.

In summary, we have an environment in which there is no consensus of the appropriateness of providing government information in electronic form to depository libraries. Old strategies that have been used to acquire materials for the Program are producing limited success. We need to adopt new strategies to persuade agencies of the advantages of depository distribution. Disincentives need to be overcome by incentives.

We are all responsible for the success of the Federal Depository Library Program. I suggest that we work together to build a new consensus. That new consensus would be that the Federal Depository Library Program is a **desirable** mechanism for federal information dissemination.

It is a different environment out there. It might change to our advantage if we accepted some of the responsibility for change ourselves.

---



## ELECTRONICORNER

**Question:** We have a very small staff and don't have time to teach each patron to use the various CD-ROM products that are coming to us through the Federal Depository Library Program. Are there any depositories that are willing to share library-produced guides that are intended to encourage independent operation of the CD-ROMS by patrons?

**Response:** Araby Greene, Documents Librarian from the University of North Carolina at Asheville, contributed the following guide. She readily acknowledges her indebtedness to the documentation that was provided with the disk. We are indebted to her for her condensation.

---

### Toxic Release Inventory On CD-ROM

What facilities in North Carolina released toxic chemicals into the environment in 1987? What are the health and ecological hazards of acetone? The Toxic Release Inventory can provide answers to these questions. Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (also known as Title III) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization (SARA) Act of 1986 requires the Environmental Protection Agency to annually inventory all toxic chemical emissions from facilities which manufacture or use large quantities of toxic chemicals. The first database, for 1987, has been made available to over 1,000 depository, state, government, academic, and public libraries in order to create awareness, concern and action for a clean environment.

In addition to the toxic release data, the file contains Health and Ecological Fact Sheets for each substance on the "313 chemicals" list. The Health Fact Sheets average 7 pages; the Ecological Fact Sheets, 2 pages.

Although Ramsey Library also has the microfiche TRI for North Carolina and neighboring states, the CD-ROM version offers many advantages to the searcher. Novice



users may perform simple searches by selecting WORD SEARCH from the menu; experienced searchers may use the ADVANCED SEARCH option to search or combine keywords, phrases, thesaurus terms, and numeric ranges for precise retrieval of information. For example, the terms CHAMPION AND NC (North Carolina) may be combined in one search. CD-ROM searches may be printed or downloaded to a floppy disk.

## GETTING STARTED

Get the Toxic Release Inventory CD-ROM from the GPO CD-ROM workstation cabinet. If another database is in use, you must EXIT from it to access the database menu. Follow instructions on the counter. Holding the disc by its edges, replace the disk in the CD-ROM disc drive with the TRI disc.

Type [5] [ENTER] to select the TRI database. Press [ENTER] at the prompt. **(In this guide, brackets [] always indicate keys to press.)**

The first screen shows a template of the function keys:

F1 HELP	F2 Hyper- Text	F3 Zoom	F4 Unzoom	F5 Search Oper.	F6 Extend Select	F7 Go	F8 Search no Copy	F9 Scroll Mode	F10 Utility Menu
------------	----------------------	------------	--------------	-----------------------	------------------------	----------	-------------------------	----------------------	------------------------

As you search, usable function keys are shown at the bottom of each screen. The TRI CD-ROM User Guide contains detailed descriptions of each function key.

## FIND MENU

You will run the "SearchExpress" system from three pull-down menus: FIND, READ, and UTILITY. All searching is done from the FIND Menu:

Advanced Search  
Word Search  
Search for Similar Objects  
Search Only Recently Added

## WORD SEARCH (NOVICE SEARCH)

To do a easy keyword search, highlight WORD SEARCH with the arrow keys, [ENTER]

The search will display the first 15 document records, or "objects."  
You may enter another number where the cursor is flashing. Press [ENTER]

Type first search word after "Words of Interest - Word 1" e.g. COORS [ENTER]  
*In TRI all suffixes are removed from words when searching; therefore, the search term "RUN" would retrieve run, runs, running, runner, etc. Think about entering word roots as search terms.*

You may change the weight assigned to a term. More weight = more important.  
[ENTER]

Type a Y (for Yes) if any retrieved document is required to contain the term.

Type an N (for No) if all retrieved documents are not required to contain the term. The system will interpret the Y's as Boolean ANDs, and the N's as Boolean ORs. A word search screen for the keywords COORS and VA (Virginia) might look like this:

Word Search		
Display Top 15 Ranked Objects		
Words of Interest	Weight	Required
Word 1 COORS	10	Y
Word 2 VA	9	Y
Word 3	8	N
Word 4	7	N

When finished entering terms, press [F7] to search. The SUMMARY SCREEN will appear (behind the Word Search Screen), listing retrieved documents by number and title. Press [F3] Move the highlight bar to the document you wish to view. Press [F3] to "ZOOM" to the DOCUMENT HEADER SCREEN. HEADERS = FIELDS. Therefore, the Header Screen lists the fields under which each document is indexed. Use [+] or [-] to see the next or previous record.

To see the document record itself, Press [F3] again to zoom to the document.

To see only paragraphs that contain the search words, Press [F3] again.



To see only sentences that contain search words, Press [F3] again.

To look at another document record, press [ESC] to return to the DOCUMENT SUMMARY SCREEN. You may also go back by pressing [F4] UNZOOM, but it's an extra step.

Note the asterisks [\*] at the right side of the SUMMARY SCREEN, next to the SCORE column. The asterisk means that the documents have been SELECTED for further functions offered on the READ or UTILITY MENUS, such as sorting or printing. The system automatically SELECTS the first three documents; to select different ones, highlight your choices and press [ENTER] (an asterisk appears); to DESELECT a title, press [ENTER] again (asterisk disappears).

To PRINT or COPY your documents, skip to the READ MENU, below.

### USING THE CONCORDANCE (INDEX)

You may also search from the CONCORDANCE (Index) while in WORD SEARCH. Press [SHIFT][F5] to open a window to the Concordance. All the terms or word roots in the database are displayed in alphabetical order. Use [PgUp][PgDn] or [ALT][S] to search. Press [ENTER] to type a selected word on the SEARCH SCREEN. To look at documents while the Concordance is being displayed, highlight term and press [F7] To exit the Concordance press [ESC] (Note that in the Concordance, numeric terms precede alphabetic terms.)

### ADVANCED SEARCHES

Although more complex than Word Search, this option allows you to build a more precise search using Boolean search operators and/or header (field) codes. Enter each search statement on a line and press [F8] Number of documents retrieved in the search set will be displayed in OBJECTS column. Sample search statements:

BACARDI OR COORS . . . . .	Document must contain one of the terms
BACARDI AND CHLORINE . . . . .	Document must contain both terms
BACARDI AND NOT CHLORINE . . . . .	Document must contain BACARDI but not CHLORINE
S1 or S2 . . . . .	Set numbers can be combined
S3 AND CHLOROFORM . . . . .	Set numbers and keywords can be combined
S2 AND NOT S1 . . . . .	Set numbers can be eliminated
XYLENE SP EXPOSURE . . . . .	Words must appear in same paragraph
XYLENE SS EYE . . . . .	Words must appear in same sentence
DOW CORNING . . . . .	Words must be adjacent in order shown

To copy documents to the SEARCH SUMMARY SCREEN, highlight a set and press [f7]

To see the CONCORDANCE (list) of all terms in the database, press [SHIFT][F5]  
Use of the Concordance is described above, under WORD SEARCH.

To see a list of all SEARCH OPERATORS, and HEADERS (FIELDS) press [F5]

Highlight a field code (use arrow keys or [ALT][S]), press [ENTER] and the field code will be typed in the search statement. Field searching can be very efficient. For example:

.NS CHLORINE AND DOW . . . . Header fields may be used in search terms  
.FS VA and .FN COORS . . . . . Header fields may be combined  
.FZ >= 21000 . . . . . FZ = zip code; number ranges may be used

Remember:

To narrow a search, AND another term or condition with it.

To broaden a search, OR another term or condition with it, or use a broader term (BEER instead of COORS).

For example: S1 AND SHENANDOAH  
S2 AND .WR GREATER THAN 50 (.WR=Water Release)

### SEARCH FOR SIMILAR OBJECTS (DOCUMENTS)

First, SELECT documents on the DOCUMENT SUMMARY SCREEN. (Highlight document, press [ENTER]) If using WORD SEARCH, set the maximum number of documents to display. Go to FIND Menu. Select SEARCH FOR SIMILAR OBJECTS. The system analyzes the selected documents to determine which words are most important; then uses those words to search for similar documents. [ESC] to WORD SEARCH or ADVANCED SEARCH SCREEN and ZOOM [F3] to the SUMMARY SCREEN where the documents will be displayed. Be patient; this search takes a long time!

### SEARCH FOR ONLY RECENTLY ADDED

At the prompt, enter the lowest object (document) number to be searched. This option remains in effect until you enter a "1" at the prompt or exit the system.



## READ MENU

Select Objects  
 Sequence Objects  
 Print Selected Documents  
 Copy Selected Documents to File

You must get to the READ MENU to print or copy documents. Press [ESC] enough times to return to the DOCUMENT SUMMARY SCREEN. Highlight READ on the Menu Bar with arrow keys. [ENTER]

### SELECT OBJECTS -

Choose this option first if you did not select records on the SUMMARY SCREEN. A menu of selection options will be shown. Press [ENTER] to select an option; then press [F7] to perform the option.

### SEQUENCE OBJECTS -

To sort documents on the SUMMARY SCREEN, choose this option. Enter up to nine two-letter "header" (field) codes. Press [F5] SEARCH OPERATOR SCREEN to see a list of all possible fields and enter codes. Enter A or D for Ascending or Descending Sort. Press [F7] to sort.

### PRINT SELECTED DOCUMENTS -

Prints selected documents according to settings on the OUTPUT OPTIONS menu (see below). If no documents have been SELECTED, this option will not do anything. Printing begins when you press [ENTER]

### COPY SELECTED DOCUMENTS TO FILE -

Menu allows you to specify filename and drive. **PLEASE COPY YOUR FILE(S) TO DRIVE A.** File(s) will be formatted according to settings on the OUTPUT OPTIONS menu (see below). Press [F7] to enter your options.

### OUTPUT OPTIONS -

Formats the information in your display, downloaded files and print outs. [ENTER] toggles options ON and OFF. If you do not want to print the HEADER SCREEN (all the field labels for the document), toggle OUTPUT DOCUMENT WITH FULL DOCUMENT DESCRIPTOR HEADING to OFF.

*For screen output, when this option is OFF, a ZOOM [F3] from the SUMMARY SCREEN will bypass the HEADER SCREEN and go directly to the DOCUMENT DISPLAY.*

If you want several documents downloaded to one file, toggle OUTPUT ALL SELECTED DOCUMENTS TO SINGLE FILE to ON. If you want to output only the header fields, begin and end on page 0. Press [F7] to enter your output options.

## UTILITY MENU

Save and Continue  
 Restore  
 Save Search Set  
 Get Search Set  
 Link Sel. Objects  
 Unlink Sel. Objects  
 Delete Sel. Objects  
 Undelete Sel. Objects  
 System Information  
 Clear Summary Screen  
 Quit

To get to the UTILITY MENU from the READ MENU, press [ESC] until you return to the DOCUMENT SUMMARY SCREEN, then highlight UTILITY on Menu Bar OR press [F10]. The UTILITY MENU is available by pressing [F10] from the Advanced Search, Word Search, or Document Summary Screen. UTILITY options are discussed on the next page.

### SAVE AND CONTINUE -

This option saves your current search session, including Advanced Search, Word Search, and Output Options. Specify DRIVE A when you supply a file name, even if you use the default name of CURRENT.SAV, for example: **a: myfile.sav**

### RESTORE -

Use to retrieve a previously saved search session.

### SAVE SEARCH SET -

Use to save the ADVANCED SEARCH SCREEN in a file. Specify a file on Drive A when prompted to supply a filename, e.g. [A: MYFILE]

### GET SEARCH SET -

Use to retrieve a previously saved ADVANCED SEARCH SCREEN. Enter the file name at the SELECT SETS TO RETRIEVE prompt: [A: MYFILE] Press [F7] to copy the saved file to the ADVANCED SEARCH SCREEN. If you want to look at another file, press [ESC]

### LINK SELECTED OBJECTS (HYPERTEXT) -

This option allows you to link documents for later retrieval. Documents to be linked must have been selected (have an asterisk beside them on the SUMMARY SCREEN). To retrieve linked documents, go to the DOCUMENT SUMMARY SCREEN; highlight the document of interest; press [F2] to retrieve all documents linked to the document.



**UNLINK SELECTED OBJECTS -**

Use [F2] to see what documents are linked; then use this option.

**DELETE SELECTED OBJECTS -**

Before using this option, SELECT documents to be deleted by marking them with an asterisk (use the [ENTER] key) on the SUMMARY SCREEN before using this option. Each deleted document will show \*\*\*DELETED\*\*\* as the title.

**UNDELETE SELECTED OBJECTS -**

Before using this option, be sure that the documents you wish to restore are marked with an asterisk on the SUMMARY SCREEN. \*\*DELETE\*\* will be replaced with the document title.

**SYSTEM INFORMATION SCREEN -**

Displays the screen seen at the start of the program.

**CLEAR SUMMARY SCREEN -**

Erases documents from the SUMMARY SCREEN.

**QUIT -**

Allows you to quit the program. Enter a [Y], then press [ENTER]

<p><b>HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE FACT SHEETS</b></p>
---

When you search for chemical names, some of the retrieved documents on the SUMMARY SCREEN will be FACT SHEETS. HEALTH FACT SHEETS will be indicated by an "H" preceding the chemical name; ECOLOGICAL FACT SHEETS, by an "E." For example:

H - XYLENES (1330-20-7) (Number is the Chemical Abstracts Registry No.)  
E - m-XYLENE (108-38-3)

---

Thanks, Araby. Similar contributions are also welcome. Please send them to: Jane Bartlett, Electronic Corner, U.S. Government Printing Office, Library Programs Service (SL), Washington DC 20401. Phone: (202) 275-1003.



## Readers Exchange

I would like to share a use we have found for the depository logo graphic.

Our student assistants work very diligently throughout the year: processing depository shipments, shelving, filing microfiche, withdrawing superseded material, etc. In honor of their graduation, my assistant, Jim Holbrock, and I designed a memorable gift for them (see below).

The card was created in WordPerfect 5.1, using the diploma.wpg (a standard graphic supplied by WordPerfect) and the depseal.wpg (available from GPO). We personalize each card and insert it in a 5x7 inch frame for an unusual graduation present.

Without the help of our hard-working student assistants, we would be hard-pressed to make important depository material available to library users on a timely basis. Jim and I believe that our students are valuable members of the depository community while they are working for us and we hope that their exposure to government documents and depository libraries contributes to a greater general awareness of such collections and services.

Submitted by:

Cheryl Rae Nyberg  
Documents/Reference Librarian  
Law Library  
College of Law  
University of Illinois at  
Urbana-Champaign

*Congratulations  
Graduate*



*Y 4. must you  
leave us?*





# Update to the List of Classes

May 9, 1991

1991-08

Page 1 of 1

Class no.	Item no.	Change/Notice
A 1.58/a:	0002	Frequency changed to semiannual.
A 13.66/18:	0085-A-01	ECOL Tech Paper (irregular) (P). New.
A 13.114/2:	0080	National Forest Annual Reports (various regions) (MF). New.
A 13.121:	0082-D-06	Headwater Herald (3 times a year) (P). New.
A 82.77:	0110-A-02	Fertilizer Supply (annual) (MF). New.
A 93.40:	0021-N-04	Discontinued.
C 3.158:M20K	0142-A	Frequency changed to quarterly.
C 3.158:M20J	0142-A	Frequency changed to quarterly.
C 3.223/7-5:	0154	1990 Census Profile (numbered) (P). New.
D 101.87:	0325-F	PS, The Prevention Maintenance Monthly (MF). Discontinued in 1985. Now reinstated. Formerly issued under item 0325-H.
D 301.8:	0422	Frequency changed to bimonthly.
E 1.113:	0429-A-18	Beam Line (quarterly) (P). New.
ED 1.30/4:	0461-B-10	Directory of Services (MF). New.
HE 20.7915:	0483-A-06	Hazardous Substances and Public Health (quarterly) (P). New.
HE 22.40:	0512-A-24	HCFA Fact Sheet (series) (P). New.
J 1.101:	0718-A-22	Justice (semiannual) (P). New.
J 29.9/7:	0968-H-22	Discontinued.
J 29.11/14:	0968-H-13	Pretrial Release of Felony Defendants (triennial) (P). New.
Ju 13.13:	0743-C-03	FJC Directions, a publication of the Federal Judicial Center (irregular) (P). New.
S 1.71/4:	0877-C	Discontinued.
S 1.118/2:	0864-B-02	Discontinued.
S 1.128:	0864-B-04	Discontinued.
S 1.128/2:	0864-B-04	Discontinued.
S 1.129:	0864-B-01	Discontinued.
S 18.1/3:	0900-C-02	Implementation of Section 620(s) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, a report to Congress (annual) (P). New.
S 18.62:	0900-C-14	Publication Series (P). New.
SI 14.15	0922-D-01	Title changed to Calendar of National Museum of African Art.
T 22.2/15:	0956-J	Update IRS International (quarterly) (P). New.

## Table of Contents

Wayne P. Kelley, Jr. Becomes U.S. Superintendent of Documents . . . .	1
Comments to Robert W. Houk, U.S. Public Printer from the Depository Library Council, Spring 1991 . . . . .	2
Monthly Catalog Cumulative Index 1990, Volume 1 Will Be Distributed to Depositories Shortly . . . . .	4
Congressional Record Pilot Project Update . . . . .	4
Automation Status of LPS in 1991 . . . . .	5
What Has the Depository Services Staff Been Doing For You Lately? .	12
Information Technology Program Update . . . . .	14
Electronic Corner: User Guide for TRI CD-ROM . . . . .	24
Readers Exchange: Student Assistants (Nyberg) . . . . .	32
Update to the List of Classes: 1991-08 . . . . .	33

*Administrative Notes* is published in Washington, DC by the Superintendent of Documents, Library Programs Service, Government Printing Office for the staffs of U.S. Federal Depository Libraries. It is generally published twice a month; some months have additional issues. Postmaster send address changes to:

The Editor, Administrative Notes

U.S. Government Printing Office

Library Programs Service, SLL

Washington, D.C. 20401

Editor: Marian W. MacGilvray

(202) 275-1130